REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 23, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the rejections and objections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The application as presented is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Initially, Applicant thanks Examiner Wong and Examiner Vincent Boccio for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview with Applicant's representative, Scott J. Gerwin, conducted on May 6, 2009. The substance of this interview is summarized herein.

I.   Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83, asserting that they do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the drawings do not show, "that the retention period is stored in the content unit" or that "the request to delete comes from the unit of content." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

With respect to the question of whether the drawings show that a retention period is stored in a content unit, Applicant would like to bring the Examiner's attention to Figure 3, which shows a unit of content 301 in which metadata 305 is stored. The portion of Applicant's specification describing Figure 3, at page 8, lines 18-30, states, "[i]n accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the metadata further includes information specifying a retention period related to the associated blob 303. The retention period may be, for example, specified as a period of time from the creation date of blob 303 and/or CDF 301during which blob 303 and CDF 301 may not be deleted." Thus, Figure 3 shows a retention period being stored in a content unit.

Applicant would appreciate clarification as to what is meant by the statement on page 2 of the Office Action that the drawings do not illustrate, "the limitation that the request to delete comes from the unit of content," as there is no limitation in any claim that relates to a request to delete coming from a unit of content. Rather, the claims require that a request to delete a unit of content is sent from a host computer, not from a unit of content.

1621685.1

Figure 1 shows a system comprising a storage system 101 that may be accessed by hosts 105 through a network 103 (see Figure 1; page 5, lines 10-17). As explained at page 4, lines 16-20 of Applicant's specification, "the storage system may store data (write) in response to a request from the host computer to store the data, return stored data (read) in response to a request from the host computer for the stored data, and delete stored data in response to a request from the host computer to delete the data."

To the extent that the drawings continue to be objected to on this basis, clarification is respectfully requested as to what limitations are believed not to be shown and why the Examiner believes the portions of the drawings discussed above do not illustrate them.

II.   Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 65, 70, and 75 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 asserting that the specification does not describe a retention period being stored in a content unit. Applicant would like to bring the Examiner's attention to Figure 3, which shows a unit of content 301 in which metadata 305 is stored. The portion of Applicant's specification describing Figure 3, at page 8, lines 18-30, states, "[i]n accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the metadata further includes information specifying a retention period related to the associated blob 303. The retention period may be, for example, specified as a period of time from the creation date of blob 303 and/or CDF 301during which blob 303 and CDF 301 may not be deleted." Thus, Figure 3 shows a retention period being stored in a content unit and it is respectfully requested that this objection to claims 65, 70, and 75 be withdrawn.

The Office Action objects to claims 65, 70, and 75 asserting that the specification does not describe a request to delete. Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention page 4, lines 16-20 of Applicant's specification, which states, "the storage system may store data (write) in response to a request from the host computer to store the data, return stored data (read) in response to a request from the host computer for the stored data, and delete stored data in response to a request from the host computer to delete the data," as well as Figure 4 and the accompanying description at page 14, lines 11-31, which relate to a process for handling a request to delete a CDF

1621685.1

from a storage system. Thus, as the specification clearly describes a request to delete, it is respectfully requested that this objection to claims 65, 60, and 75 be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Applicant understands claims 65-78 to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the same reasons for which these claims are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75, and respectfully disagrees with these rejections for the same reasons discussed above in connection with the objections under 37 C.F.R. §1.75.

As should be clear from the discussion above, each of claims 65-78 satisfies the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 65-78 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Stuart (2005/0055519) in view of MacPhail (5,107,419). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 65-69

During the telephone interview, Applicant's representative explained that neither MacPhail nor Stuart discloses storing a retention period for a unit of content in the unit of content, and neither discloses a request to delete the unit of content that identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in a part, from at least the portion of the unit of unit of content that includes the retention period. Applicant's representative asked the Examiners to explain how they were interpreting the references to disclose these limitations of claim 65.

Examiners Wong and Boccio agreed that neither Stuart nor MacPhail discloses an identifier for a unit of content that is generated using the retention period for the unit of content, but questioned whether claim 65 was limited to generating the content address for the unit of content from the portion of the unit of content that includes the retention period.

1621685.1

Applicant's representative explained that claim 65 recites that the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and also requires that, "the at least a portion of the content of the unit of content" from which the content address is generated includes the previously-defined retention period.

The Examiners noted that claim 65 states, "wherein the at least **a** portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period," and explained that because this limitation uses the indefinite article "a" instead of the definite article "the" it was unclear whether the "at least a portion" of the content of the unit of content that includes the previously-defined retention period is the same "at least a portion" from which the content address is, at least in part, generated. The Examiners indicated that if this limitation were amended to recite, "wherein the at least **the** portion of the content of the unit of unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period," it would be clear that the content address be generated, at least in part, from the portion of the content of the unit of content that includes the previously-defined retention period.

Claim 65 has been so amended. As agreed during the telephone interview, neither Stuart nor MacPhail discloses or suggests, "receiving a request, from the host, to delete a unit of content stored on the storage system, wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least the portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period."

As such, claim 65 patentably distinguishes over the asserted combination of Stuart and MacPhail, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 66-69 depend from claim 65 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 66-69 also be withdrawn.

<u>Claims 70-78</u>

Independent claim 70 is directed to at least one computer readable storage medium encoded with instructions that, when executed on a computer system, perform a method comprising, *inter alia*, an acts of, "receiving a request, from the host, to delete a unit of content stored on the storage system, wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least the portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period."

Independent claim 75 is directed to a storage system comprising, *inter alia,* at least one controller that, "receives a request, from the host, to delete a unit of data stored on the storage system, wherein a previously-defined retention period for the unit of content is stored in the unit of content, wherein the request identifies the unit of content using a content address generated, at least in part, from at least a portion of the content of the unit of content, and wherein the at least the portion of the content of the unit of content includes the previously-defined retention period."

As should be clear from the discussion above, the asserted combination of Stuart and MacPhail does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted limitation of claim 70 or the above-quoted limitation of claim 75. As such, each of claims 70 and 75 patentably distinguishes over this combination of Stuart and MacPhail. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 71-74 depend from claim 70 and claims 76-78 depend from claim 75. Each of these dependent claims is patentable for at least the same reasons as its respective independent claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 71-74 and 76-78 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. E0295.70289US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 15, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

By

Scott J. Gerwin
Registration No.: 57,866
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000

1621685.1